

# NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

## ARRIVAL OF THE CALEDONIA.

FIFTEEN DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.

The steamer Caledonia arrived at Boston on Monday, with London dates to the 2d, and Liverpool to the 4th instant.

The Oregon question seems to be completely submerged in the interest attached to the great victory over the Sikhs, in India, which we notice below.

Commercial matters are in an unsettled gloomy state. In many of the manufacturing towns there are thousands of workmen out of employment, and the markets for all descriptions of produce are in a state of stagnation. The iron trade seems to be the only exception to this.

Large cargoes of Indian corn were daily reaching the British ports from the United States, and large quantities had been released from bond, duty free, under the Treasury order. Shops for its exclusive retail sale were being opened in many of the large towns, and the American mode of using it was generally adopted.

The House of Commons have passed Sir Robert Peel's bill to a second reading, but it is spoken of as doubtful whether it can pass the House of Lords. In case it does not pass, the question will go to the country in the form of a general election. The second reading was carried in the Commons by a majority of eighty-eight, which is nine votes less than the bill received when first introduced.

Private letters mention that preparations for the visit of Queen Victoria to the King and Queen of the French were proceeding without intermission at the Tuilleries, Neuilly, St. Cloud, and Versailles.

Mr. McLane, the American Minister, was prevented by indisposition from attending the Queen's drawing-room on the 19th ult., but Mrs. McLane, and the American Secretary of Legation were present.

The emigration from Germany to the United States would this year have been very great, but the fear of war upon the Oregon question prevented large numbers from leaving.

There is nothing of interest from France and the Continent. The Committee of the Chamber of Deputies on the Alger budget met on Saturday, the 28th of March, when the Minister of War was present. The principal question discussed was as to the formation of Algeria into a separate department under a new Minister. The members of the committee expressed themselves generally as favorable to that measure, and the report will be in favor of it. Should the Chamber approve of the plan, it is believed that M. Deferre will be the new Minister of Algeria.

From Spain we learn that Narvaez had been entrusted with the formation of a new Ministry. He named himself Minister of War, President of the Council ad interim, and Minister of Foreign Affairs. In consequence of the stringent measures of the Ministry, all the newspapers in Madrid, with the exception of one or two in the pay of Narvaez, had been suspended. The crisis in a most agitated state.

### END OF THE WAR IN INDIA.

Since the dispatch of our paper by the "Union," our advice from Bombay inform of two more great battles having been fought in India between the British and Sikh armies, both terminating in decisive victory to the former. The first was under the command of Sir H. Smith, and the latter Sir Hugh Gough, which was perhaps one of the most bloody record.

In Sir H. Smith's battle, the whole army of the enemy has been driven headlong over the difficult ford of a broad river; his camp, cannon, (fifty-six pieces), baggage, stores of ammunition and of grain—his art, in fact, wrested from him by the repeated charges of cavalry and infantry; and in that of Sir Hugh Gough the Sikhs lost twelve thousand men and six hundred pieces of artillery. The English had three hundred men killed, thirteen of whom were officers, and two thousand five hundred wounded, of whom one hundred and one were officers. Her Majesty's fifty-third and sixty-second regiments suffered enormously. General Dicke and Brigadier Taylor are among the dead.

The action commenced in the morning, and the work of destruction had closed by eleven o'clock in the forenoon. Sir Hugh Gough's account of this battle proves it to have been, while it lasted, one of the most terrible on record. Unlike the able manoeuvring of Sir H. Smith, this affair seems to have owed its success to the daring intrepidity of our men, who stormed the enemy's entrenchments, bayonet in hand, defended as they were by thirty thousand Sikhs and seventy pieces of artillery. The slaughter was immense, for our troops braved the enemy's fire by reserving their shot until they got within his entrenchments. The action terminated in the complete rout of the enemy, the capture of his guns, and the loss of his camp and baggage. An awful sacrifice of life took place on the Sutlej, in attempting to cross which our troops mowed down thousands of the flying foe, and those who escaped the fire were drowned in the stream. This victory has put the finishing stroke to the war. It has brought the Sikhs to their knees, and they are now humble suppliants for mercy and forbearance. They have agreed to pay a million and a half sterling, in the course of four years, toward the expenses of the war, the payment to be enforced by the occupation of Lahore.

Thus has ended a war respecting the consequences of which a good deal of anxiety not unnaturally prevailed—war forced upon us by the peculiar exigencies of the case, from which we could not shrink, but for which we had made no previous preparation, and no adequate foresight. The Sikhs took an ungenerous advantage of the long alliance which had existed between us and their great ruler, Runjeet Singh; and their perfidy has been punished in a manner fully commensurate with its enormity—punished promptly, energetically, and in a style which promises in all future time to prevent a repetition of conduct at once base, dishonorable, and uncalled for.

### Proclamation by the Governor-General of India.

CAMP, LUCKNOW, FEBRUARY 18, 1846.  
The chiefs, merchants, traders, ryots, and other inhabitants of Lahore and Unruhur, are hereby informed that his Highness Maharajah Duleep Singh has this day waited upon the Right Honorable the Governor-General, and expressed the contrition of himself and the Sikh Government for their late hostile proceedings. The Maharajah and Durbur having acquiesced in all the terms imposed by the British Government, the Governor-General having every hope that the relations of friendship will speedily be established between the two Governments, the inhabitants of Lahore and Unruhur have nothing to fear from the British army.

The Governor-General and the British troops, if the conditions above adverted to are fulfilled, and no further hostile opposition is offered by the Khalsa army, will aid their endeavors for the re-establishment of the Government of the descendants of Maharajah Runjeet Singh, and for the protection of its subjects.

The inhabitants of the cities in the Punjab will in that case be perfectly safe in person and property from any molestation by the British troops, and they are hereby called upon to discontinue apprehension, and to follow their respective callings with all confidence.

By order of the Right Hon. the Governor-General of India.  
F. CURRIE,  
Secretary to the Governor of India.

General Smith's battle was fought on the 28th of January. He had been ordered by the commander-in-chief to form a junction with the force in Ludhiana, which was menaced by a formidable body of Sikhs, 30,000 strong, under the command of Runjeet Singh. Sir Harry Smith's force is set down at 12,000. The Sikhs were strongly entrenched on the Sutlej, the position covered by some forty or fifty guns of large caliber. They were entirely routed. The British loss in this battle is reported in the despatch at 151 killed, 413 wounded, and 25 missing.

The second battle of this series—the fourth in all—was fought on the 10th of February. The Sikhs were attacked in their position on the Sutlej by the whole Anglo-Indian force, the division under Sir Harry Smith having rejoined the main body of the British. The British loss in this battle was 2,383, namely 320 killed, 2,063 wounded. The forces engaged were equal—the Sikhs having 30,000 and their assailants about the same number, after the junction of Sir Harry Smith's brigade.

## FROM OUR EUROPEAN CORRESPONDENT.

PARIS, MARCH 15, 1846.

Several epistles of the latest dates were sent to you by the Havre packet which sailed on the 12th instant. We have just learnt that the steamer *Union* will leave Liverpool for Halifax on the 19th instant. The epistles may not reach you so soon as the present communication, but you may take them as historical and as honest testimony of the impressions in this meridian produced by some of the proceedings. It is not my object to ingratiate or to disfavor myself with any of your parties or men; you may tolerate opinions which are sincere and consistent, and formed under circumstances favorable to clear and impartial judgment, though they may happen to militate against your own ideas and politics. The burden of party song is rather monotonous. A dissimilar variety can afford some relief and possess some interest. Here, we have continued to be all Polish; committees, subscriptions, processions of old and young, choruses of journals, metropolitan and provincial, assemblages in the lobbies of the theatres, and at the doors and in the galleries of the Deputies, and, finally, debates of the Chamber. A grand delegation of our Polish Monarchical Refugee Society of a thousand members, virtually tendered the crown to Prince CZARORISKI, and you will see that the Polish Association of London, representing all the emigrants in Great Britain and Ireland, have done the same. These committees acknowledge his Highness as their chief, and submit to his "orders, guidance, commands, without any regard to the political opinions which individually they may profess." The Prince modestly referred to the will of the *National* Government when it should be expressed. Since the reoccupation of Cracow by the three great Powers, and the surrender of various large bodies of the insurgents, the said Government is an errant ghost. You are aware that a large portion of the Polish emigrants, every where, professed downright republicanism; the occasion that excited a common national enthusiasm has been seized to rally them to the head of the monarchical party and elective King. Nearly two hundred of the members of the French Chamber of Deputies have subscribed in aid of the combatant Poles—not fifteen hundred dollars altogether. Mr. THIERS would not appear at all: the Peers have all kept aloof. No tactics will suffice to bring the *national* subscription to ten thousand dollars. "What a prodigious emotion!" says La Presse, ironically; "what a subsidy for the twenty-four millions of oppressed and struggling patriots! Fine relief for so many thousands of victims! The columns of our journals are filled with names of subscribers, but the contributions are so small that the aggregate, instead of evidencing deep French sympathy, can be interpreted by Europe into nothing else than proof of our indifference or parsimony." This is true. Our bourgeois of Paris get money, much money, from the Russians, Austrians, and Prussians; they see the eleemosynary Poles with less favor than their opulent customers; every effort has been tried to band the National Guards as subscribers; but the manufacturers, shopkeepers, and mechanics, of whom that body is mainly composed, sympathize only so far as they are of French Radical politics. In regard to the provincial masses of this nation, scarcely a half of the number do or can read, or have the least notion of the Northern French, as the Poles are here styled. Besides, every one who observes and understands party politics comprehends the game of domestic revolutionary excitement. On Thursday last Monsieur DE LA ROCHEJACQUELIN, Deputy, gave notice that he would call on the Ministry next day for explanations touching the Polish affair. Mr. Guizot promptly and gladly acceded. It was just what he desired. The name of the Deputy is identified with the cause of extreme Legitimacy. Crowds were assembled, as the *chapeaux* are in the theatres, to hear the *interpellation* and its results. The Deputy managed his case ill, and was ill-served by his few supporters in the debate; they played unwittingly into the hands of the Minister; they enabled him to deliver a sensible, plausible discourse, which cut the whole injudicious Opposition enterprise in the very middle, and sent away the convocation of fiery auditors utterly disconcerted and disappointed. I enclose Galignani's abstract (quite imperfect) of his clever speech.

The Opposition defeated themselves, in fact, by adopting and embellishing the fictions, distortions, hyperboles, enormous exaggerations of the newspapers. Mr. Guizot could not merely deny incredible and proofless charges, but bestow with a good grace praise on the Austrian and Prussian Administration of their Polish annexations. He bore no testimony to the Russian on account of the court-piques; that, however, has probably as strong claims. The Northern Governments are better to themselves than they are thought and represented to be; the sorry plight of the masses of their subjects, new and old, comes from that monarchical system to which feudal aristocracy is integral; the people, the rural population in particular, are necessarily stultified, debased, half-barbarized; add to their peculiar servitude and abjection the want of immediate care on the side of the feudal lords, and a dearth of food, and what excesses of indiscriminate submission or rebellion, reckless violence, and blind accomplicity may you not expect? Mr. Guizot related from official sources that, in the disturbed provinces, the peasantry were ferociously hostile to the Noblesse and Liberals who summoned them to arms; that Prince Metternich had signified to him his dread, not of political convulsions so much as social massacre and devastation. In some instances the gatherings of bores first cut down with scythes their masters and other instigators, collected and shouldered the swords and muskets, and marched to join some body or garrison of *insurgents*. Mr. Guizot argued that, as the new state of France was accepted by Europe, so the old state of Europe was accepted by her; that her business lay in watching and regulating the political condition of her neighbors, Belgium, Switzerland, and Spain; no aid for Poland, except what squared with her interests and the laws of nations. He asked what the French at home would say if other nations undertook to help the Arabs against the French in Algeria. A Deputy exclaimed, "the comparison is not happy;" yet it was not quite so far amiss, if Mr. Guizot meant to remind his crowded auditory that they were pursuing and perpetrating across the Mediterranean what deserved reprobation at least as much as the enormities of purpose and act imputed to the Austrians and Russians in the Polish provinces. He might have gone further, and adverted to the large share which the Bourbons took in using and aggravating the anarchy of the kingdom, and how much Polish blood the French Revolutionary Governments, and NAPOLEON after them, caused to be shed utterly in vain for Polish interests. The inquirer has to look into Flassan's History of French Diplomacy and the histories of Thiers and Bignon for ample information on those points. Poland, in fact, has been (if I may be allowed the phrase and figure) a nest-egg for the Government of this country, ever since the Revolution of July, as a diplomatic means with the three Powers, or with a view to the constantly possible war with the North. Countenance has been vouchsafed, at all periods, to the Polish Emigrant Monarchical Association. The Republican Poles commended too intimately with the French Radicals not to be objects of suspicion and restraint, aside from the natural preference for their compatriot antagonists. Mr. Guizot observed beautifully, "It is a painful but a sacred duty to utter truth to respected and respectable misfortune; it should be more effective, it is even criminal, to deceive the unfortunate—to cherish in their minds 'fatal delusions.'" ORLEANS BARROT concluded a few sounding sentences with the exclamation, "Yes, I have faith in the power of right and of Polish nationality." The London oracles express the same faith. Unquestionably Austria has something to fear from the animosities of race and religion in Galicia and Hungary. Prussia is exposed to the same; to direct political discontents; and to mixed seditious theological polemics. "Communist-propaganda" has not been successful in the German dominions, any more than in Switzerland, where even the Democratic cantons proscribe it by severe edicts. A Pan-slavonic league has been, for several years past, so industriously, stimulative, and widely preached, that it seems to be no longer a delusive phantasm or wild conceit. The *National* raves at the lukewarmness or treachery of the French Government; it consoles itself with the persuasion that the revolutionary and Democratic cause will right and revenge itself at no distant day; "the whole of old Europe," it proclaims, "is in ferment and dislocation; convulsions are inevitable, north and south." As yet, however, the Russian, Austrian, and Prussian dominions are too strong, in many respects, to be materially shaken; they are, perhaps, rendered stronger, as well as more watchful and despotic, by outbreaks like those they are now suppressing with a common concern and spirit. All the European monarchies are roused and set on the alert for their domestic safety. We hear of a factitious agitation in Italy from the Polish fury. The *National* of this morning tells us that the most auspicious advices of the progress of the insurrection were received yesterday afternoon; "bands had entered the Carpathian mountains, and a guerrilla war commenced; the movement extends certainly to Volhynia, Podolia, the Ukraine, and a part of Samogitia; perturbation pervaded Hungary; the three Powers took the utmost pains to prevent the real working and aspect of affairs from becoming known beyond their own frontiers." The "National" adds that the Marseilles and Varsoviennes hymns were sung together, with incredible enthusiasm, in the provincial cities of France; and it publishes, in really good English, passionate exhortations to the Britons in this realm to open their purses to the Polish cause.

Admit the following extract and admire the philanthropy and Christianity that have been every where abroad and nowhere at home:  
EDUCATION IN WALES.—MR. WILLIAMS moved an address to Her Majesty for the institution of an inquiry into the state of education in the principality of Wales, especially into the means afforded to the laboring classes of acquiring a knowledge of the English language. The language of the educated classes throughout Wales, and of the inhabitants of the towns, was English; but the language of the laboring classes, especially in the rural districts, was Welsh. The Rev. Mr. Griffiths, the president of a dissenting college in Wales, and a person well acquainted with its condition, reported that there were 250,000 children who ought to receive that education, but that there were only 70,000 of them who received any education at all—that of this number 70,000, a great portion received an education so inferior as to be only nominal; and that there were 180,000 children whose immoral spirits were totally left without that guide which all men ought to receive from a sound, moral, and religious education. As a proof of the prevalent desire of the population of Wales to obtain education, he mentioned that on Sunday schools in Wales, which were well attended by adults, as well as females, who had undergone the most severe labor during six days of the week. He then quoted at some length the report of the Commissioners of Education in Wales, and especially of Mr. Trevelyan, to show the lamentable deficiency of education in the principality of Wales, as inferred from the extracts which he read, that the extent of the deficiency would be confounded on its inhabitants, by giving them a sound, moral, and religious education, would be incalculable. He could multiply such extracts a hundredfold, but he would confine himself only to a few.

### SPEECH OF MR. GUIZOT.

REFERRED TO IN THE PRECEDING LETTER.

#### CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES.—POLISH QUESTION.

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS said that among the questions that had been put to him by the honorable Deputy, that on which he most particularly insisted, related to the policy and acts of a foreign Government, and not to those of the French Government. For that reason he declined to enter into the line of conduct he had always adopted in that respect—to speak of what he knew. [Hear, hear.] If the acts which had been reported were true, he would not hesitate to designate them as deplorable and guilty. To provoke a social convulsion, a civil war, a political revolution, and to kindle a criminal act. Revolutionaries were sometimes guilty of such acts, but regular Governments never. [Applause from the Centres.] From the information which had, however, reached him, he had seen nothing to confirm the facts of which he spoke, and, far from admitting them to be true on the faith of the journals and the newspapers, which had been quoted, he should be more inclined to deny them. In order to explain the part which the peasants of the Grand Duchy of Posen and of Galicia had just been playing, there was no necessity of bringing forward suppositions and hypotheses of prices being placed on the heads of certain parties which the honorable Deputy had alluded to. Since the Grand Duchy of Posen and Galicia have been placed under the jurisdiction of the Emperor of Austria, both those Governments have used their utmost exertions to ameliorate the condition of the peasants. In the Grand Duchy of Posen, as in all the provinces of the monarchy, the Prussian Government had constantly endeavored to improve the condition of those people, and they had a right to hold land; they had obtained special jurisdiction, and the other things under which they had been formerly placed. When, therefore, an attempt was made to excite them to join in the revolt, they had refused, because their situation was now better than it had ever hitherto been. The same had taken place in Galicia, where, since the laws of Maria Theresa and Joseph II, the condition of the peasant had been much ameliorated. It was the true reason which had influenced the conduct of the peasants of Galicia. There was not the slightest necessity to bring forward these odious suppositions of the setting a price on the heads of the nobles and the clergy; they had stronger motives for their conduct in the improved condition in which they had been placed.

At the very moment when these events were threatening, before the results of the insurrection were known, the Austrian Government foresaw all that happened, and it had expressed its fears that a revolution among the peasants would break out simultaneously with another insurrection; and it feared that the condition of the peasants would be such as to kindle a civil war. This is what was foreseen by Prince de Metternich, who communicated it to the French Government. The Chamber might form its opinion on these assertions. He was not charged to defend from that tribune such or such a foreign Government; but he considered himself called upon to disclaim all ideas and erroneous opinions. He might refrain from entering into special jurisdiction on the subject; but he would not quit the tribune without explaining the policy of the Government. [Hear, hear.] It was not without a deep feeling of grief, and without a serious conviction that his friends and himself had in 1831 adopted and supported, with regard to Poland, the line of policy which had been followed by the Chamber. The Chamber had to consider the motives of their conduct and of their policy—the non-intervention of France in the affairs of Poland. The interest of France called for this policy. They thought that after the revolution of July, France should establish her own Government, and cover with her banner not only her own independence, but that of those countries which were closely connected with her—Belgium, Switzerland, and Spain. The national interest of France imposed this policy on them. Another motive influenced them—the right of nations. France accepted the state of Europe; and it was a matter of faith to maintain good relations between the Governments.

Such were the motives which in 1831 determined the line of policy to be adopted by France, and they had been too long discussed from that tribune to make it necessary for him to allude further to them on the present occasion; and now, when after sixteen years they were reaping the fruits of their policy—prosperity and security at home, and consideration and dignity abroad—he did not consider it with moderation to abandon it, on motives less noble and less important than those which led to its adoption in 1831. This policy imposed on them two duties towards the unfortunate Poles, and the second, to render them every relief compatible with the interest of France and with the law of nations. Such had always been their line of conduct, and such it would continue to be, and whilst they remained faithful to this line of duty, they had a right to hope that men, who placed themselves under the protection of France, would not forget the duty imposed on them, not to compromise the hospitality they received. What would be the feelings of the Chamber were it to learn that Abel de Cafer was receiving assistance from a foreign Power? Was there any one in that assembly but would feel that the interests of France were thwarted by such a proceeding? He begged the Chamber not to lose sight of those facts, and of the position in which they placed the Government. He was anxious that those who claimed and obtained the hospitality of France, should give a rule for their conduct. France wished to be a place of refuge for the oppressed, but not a resort for conspirators. [Applause from the Centres.]

They have not yet reached us.—EUREAS.

PARIS, APRIL 1, 1846.

The Journal des Debats of the 23d March presents a Court reply of four columns to the inviolability contrast which M. THIERS drew between the intervention of the French King in government and the abstraction of the British Sovereign. An intelligent survey of the reign of George III. begets a parallel less unfavorable to Louis PHILIPPE I.: "We cannot deny," adds the Debats, "that it would be dangerous now—a day to push royal prerogative to the extreme to which it was carried by George; when history is cited, let this be done with truth." The passage of the Thiers-manifesto most enjoyed and quoted is this: "You know that England has gone through the same revolutions as ourselves—a Parliament that immolated a King; then a potent general who dominated over the Parliament; then, a Restoration; and, finally, a Revolution of 1688, resembling ours of 1830." William, of Holland, mounted the throne of England; and from this era, not earlier, dates true representative government in England. Well, William wished to be master; he also, (but, alas!) that surprised William desired what all princes seek, and I say, blockhead he who wonders at this; and weak, very weak, the citizen who submits to it. The *l'uni*, universally applied as it was directed, stares apart in all the Opposition sheets. Most of the recent debates of the British Parliament are margined for your paper; I find, however, that the passages selected and my notes would demand more of your space and my leisure than can be conceded. Nearly all the discussions of the Tariff and the Corn Laws contain statistics and references to American matters which claim American attention. In the sitting of the Commons on the 28th ultimo, you may remark the new enthusiasm of Sir JAMES GRAHAM:

"He reminded the House that the Government of this country was vested mainly in land. Such a Government, to maintain itself, must be impartial in its legislation; and when they considered the concentration, the growing intelligence, and the increasing population of the manufacturing districts, and reflected that the population of those districts entertained a deep settled opinion that the operation of the corn laws was to enhance the price of food and to lower the rate of wages, they must see that if they refused this bill that the population will no longer place confidence in the impartiality of their legislation. After showing since 1830 at great length that the amount of crime and of mortality always increased as the price of bread increased, he concluded by declaring that, after looking at this matter dispassionately and gravely, he could not say that the opinions of the manufacturing population were unsound and untrue; and, believing it to be sound and true, and believing also that the spread of it was most dangerous to the rights of property and the peace of the country, unless a practical remedy were applied in time, on the responsibility of office, with a safe conscience and an unbiased judgment, he gave his unqualified support to the measure now under consideration. [Cheers.] It was necessary, perhaps, that he should say, with reference to domestic peace, that no time should be lost. [Hear, hear.] And with respect to our foreign relations, he was also of opinion that this measure was decidedly necessary. Nations advantageously trading with each other, in a heavy recognition, to keep the public peace. The current of trade, once suffered to run free, always deepened its channels and extended its ramifications. There were a few lines in Pope's 'Windsor Forest' which appeared to him so beautifully applicable to this subject of the extension of trade that he could not refrain from quoting them. Looking forward to the future, he was happy to say that when London should become a free port, he apprehended that noble river, which was the channel to this metropolis of the commerce of the world, in these lines: 'The time will come, when, free as seas or wind, Unbounded Thames shall flow for all mankind. While nations enter with each swelling tide, And seas but join the regions they divide, Earth's distant ends our glory shall behold, And a new world launch forth to seek the old.'"

On the same occasion, Lord PALMERSTON spoke like an oracle of a meeting-house. You will see in what was passed, on the 23d, touching the British and French operations in Rio de la Plata, that Sir ROBERT PEEL denied the existence of *war* with precedents and arguments that smacked of hoax and mockery. Sir ROBERT INGLES struck the true chord in this way: "About two centuries ago [cries of hear, hear, and laughter] the Dutch sailed up the Medway in such a manner in which Her Majesty's fleet sailed up the River Plate. [Hear, hear.] He would ask whether that was considered war? [Hear, hear.] Subsequently another fleet, being the combined squadrons of Russia, France, and England, blockaded another port, entered another harbor, and destroyed another fleet—namely, the fleet of Turkey. Was that considered war? He could see no distinction between these cases. Would it satisfy the friends of peace to say that we were not at war, when ships were taken and many lives lost in the gallant achievement of Lord Cochrane and his friend Captain Hope? Would the Quakers be satisfied that we were not at war, when we were surrounded by all the incidents of war? [Hear, hear.] What was war if it was not the loss of human lives, the capture of ships, and the destruction of a whole fleet? If these things could be done in time of peace, he thought they had yet to learn what war was. [Hear, hear.]

In my former communications I mentioned to you that the political horizon at Madrid was deeply overcast. The storm burst in the middle of last month. It is sufficiently described as follows:

"The Constitutional Government is suspended in Spain—the Cortes are indefinitely prorogued; the liberty of the press is provisionally abolished; a decree forbids the journals, under pain of absolute or temporary suppression, to attack not only the Queen, the royal family, and the constitution, but also foreign sovereigns and their families; the same inviolability is extended to all functionaries, to their official acts, and to the measures of the Government. It is the Council of Ministers that is to pronounce the penalties stated above against the journals. The new Ministry publishes at the same time a manifesto, in which it declares itself to be an idolatrous adorer of the Throne, the most ancient institution of Spain; it menaces the Constitution with new attacks, under pretext of menacing the equilibrium destroyed among the public powers; it announces its intention to give full satisfaction to the clergy; it declares that it will not recede before any measure, however severe it may appear, to accomplish its designs; it informs functionaries that they shall be immediately dismissed and punished, if they oppose the plans of the Cabinet; it places, in fine, the execution of the projects which it has meditated under the sanction of the law. It is a counter-revolution for the profit of absolute royalty and of clerical power, effected by some soldiers, intoxicated with pride, under the command of a woman."

Quidnuncs awaited the *Journal des Debats* to judge how the French Court and Cabinet would deem it expedient to express themselves about the new Spanish whirl. From this meridian, NARVAEZ had been set on ESPARTERO; incited and abetted in all his measures and designs after the expulsion of the honest Regent: see how the Debats now complains:

"It is not easy to comprehend what political motives can explain the strange conduct of General Narvaez, breaking up in a few days two Ministries, his own and that of the Marquis de Miraflores, both favored with the confidence of the Cortes, in order to form a new one, the principal merit of which will be, apparently, not to be able to support itself except by force and illegality! This is a coup d'Etat of a new kind. It is not against a dissatisfied majority that it is directed, there is not between the present Cortes and the Sovereign the slightest conflict. The former Cabinet of General Narvaez had the majority; it pleased General Narvaez to withdraw and to produce a ministerial crisis in the midst of peace: a new Cabinet was formed by the Queen, and the new Cabinet, composed of honest men, at once had the majority in the Cortes. Against whom, then, was the change directed? Who was to be struck? The Progressives were no longer in question; it is his own party that General Narvaez dissolves violently, the moderate party, the party of the Queen and of the constitutional monarchy! It looks as if a reign of terror was intended to be organized, just as if Spain was on fire. Men are alone summoned to power whose names called to mind lugubrious antecedents; it looks as if preparations were being made for a battle. What does General Narvaez want? The chief power? He had it, with the Cortes and with the liberty of the press! Spain was tranquil, the throne ran no danger. Truly this revolution might be called an effect without a cause, if, alas! the blindness of personal passions did not explain every thing! How is it possible not to pity this generous Spanish nation and the young Queen, whom her interference reduces to a ruler reduced to be only the instrument of those who surround her? We do not accuse her,

she is a stranger to the great faults of her Government. The crown is only a vain decoration on her head. She has no will, and cannot have any. Spain is a field open to the ambitious: it is a republic where the chief power falls successively into the hands of the most adroit or the most daring."

The *Constitutionnel*, the organ of Mr. THIERS, and therefore generally well informed, did not hesitate to charge the French Government with having been at least privy to the transactions thus denounced. The Debats replied, and denied; but the *Constitutionnel* pursued the case, thus:

"A Madrid journal, the *Espanol*, remarked on the 13th that the Court, General Narvaez, and the Embassy of France had frequent communications, and that a courier had been dispatched by M. Brisson for France. Some days after the Debats announced, in a postscript to the news from Spain, that the Miraflores Ministry was dissolved, and that Narvaez was to be ordered to compose a cabinet. All persons who follow with interest the affairs of Spain were surprised to find nothing of the kind for some days in the Spanish journals. But their surprise was greater when late events proved to them that the news communicated to the Debats had possessed all the value of a prophecy, and that our Ministerial journal received here in March the confidence of a fact which M. Miraflores, the head of the Spanish Ministry, was himself ignorant of at the same date, and of the events which were about to be accomplished at Madrid the next day. The Debats feels some embarrassment in explaining this premature information; it contents itself with gratifying the liberal intentions of our Government relative to Spain, and it gives, as a proof of it, the severe reflections which it has itself been publishing for two days relative to the *empire* of Narvaez. The proof is worth nothing. It is not the first time that the Debats, whilst receiving information from the Ministry, appeared to go against the Ministerial policy. It is sometimes a sincere opposition, as in the question of public instruction—sometimes a part assumed, a liberal varius, with which it envelops the policy of which it is the principal defender."

It is impossible to conjecture what the French participation or resistance may have been. In regard to Spain, the game here has uniformly seemed, not *double* merely, but quintuple or deuple. I have conversed, within the eight years past, with eminent Spaniards of all political denominations, and all were perplexed, uncertain, apprehensive. One of them observed to me last Sunday, "You see that our Royalty is at its last gasp; there must be a federative republic—an Iberian Union, to include Portugal." All the thunder and lightning, however, appear to have been on the mountain; the people of Spain have betrayed no emotion; ESPARTERO's friends expect the easy man as a deliverer—vainly we may presume.

The surging in the Polish concern is now in the *National* and a few other Radical organs. They assure us, this day, that the Galician peasants were likely to join the insurgent bands of patriots who had reached the Carpathian Mountains. They are provided with fresh matter for a foam in an encyclical letter of the Pope, who condemns the insurrection, and a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of a very different cast and purpose. In Germany, Austria is the bulwark of the Roman Catholic cause; in Italy, the safeguard of the Pope's temporal power. That his Holiness should assist his own surest ally, cannot astonish, and should hardly offend any reflecting Liberal. The Archbishop prefers Polish catholicity; being duly associated in politics and domestic objects with the Legationists. Last week, in his chair in the College of France, Professor MICHAELIS railed at the successor of St. Peter for his *discretion*; and another lecturer, at the Sorbonne, poured vituperations into the ranks of the northern monarchies. On the 25th ultimo the *Chartist* friends of Poland held a public meeting of sympathy in London, from which the gentry kept themselves aloof, "doubting whether a demonstration at this juncture would aid the Polish cause." A German speaker trusted that "in the news of the struggle reached America, the people there would forget their quarrel with England, in order to make some powerful effort in the cause of unfortunate Poland." The Debats complains of the confiscation of the CZARORISKI estates by Austria, seeing that the Prince had rallied all the Polish emigrants to the shibboleth of *monarchy*. It condemns the sovereign Pontiff's encyclical admonitions, with the acknowledgment that strong vibrations of the revolutionary chords extended over the continent were already felt in the Roman States. The *National* of this morning hopes that Polish sympathies had not contributed to the affray at *Saint Etienne*, of which we have just heard, between the *operatives* and the armed force, in which a number of the former were killed. We have electroneering circulars from two branches of the Opposition—the *Left Centre* and the *Left*: they proclaim that the destinies of the representative system in France are to be determined this summer, and that the liberties which have been bartered away must be wrested from the traffickers: all political power and place, they reiterate, has become a mere selfish speculation. *E contra*, the Debats exclaims: "We have the cause of monarchy, in our hands, against the paltry passions and loose principles of the two *Lefts*."

A renewed commercial convention between Belgium and France occupied the Chamber of Deputies yesterday and the day before. It was deemed an advance in the career of commercial liberalism. It is injurious to several French natural and artificial products. The Deputies who advocate protection, criticised it unsparingly; Sir ROBERT PEEL's measures were handled, of course; his motives, predictions, and the pith of his whole transformation were canvassed with adequate intelligence. The first speaker, on the 30th, said, in substance, what follows: "The real object of the reform now going on in England was not, he observed, by any means a disinterested example which that Power desired to lay before Europe, in order to bring about the triumph of commercial liberty. Her only object was, by lowering the duties on the matters serving as food to the working classes, to diminish the price of the produce which she exported to all parts of the world; and thus to be able to compete with more advantage with her rivals in manufactures. Far from looking on what passed in England as a motive for lowering the tariff, the honorable Deputy considered it a peremptory reason for not effecting what he called a 'commercial amendment.'"

Yesterday afternoon the discussion assumed an important character. After an able speech by the member from *Amiens*, in the sense of the foregoing extract, the Minister of Commerce delivered his sentiments in detail, and expounded the tariff policy of his Department at least. I am sorry that it is not consistent with my day's duty to send you a version of his speech as reported in the *Moniteur* of this morning. He referred to the desire of the Chamber to learn his views of the changes in progress in England; he had no wish to withhold them. He proceeded:

"The question is a delicate one, but I shall not hesitate to speak on it. They who behold in the reform proposed to the English Parliament a homage paid to the theory of absolute commercial liberty are quite mistaken. [Hear, hear.] They who think that England gives us in this an example which we ought to eagerly follow, have formed an opinion which we consider altogether premature. [Hear, hear.] England, when she legislates for her commerce, never listens to any whisperings but those which her interest suggests; in that we ought to imitate her. She does not allow herself to be moved by theories—she looks chiefly to facts. Nowhere was the prohibitive system practised for a longer time or more completely than with her, and she departed from it only when she saw that an absolute necessity existed for her to find new markets. What does the reform now before Parliament propose to do? It modifies the corn laws, and shifts to manufacturing wealth the preponderance which has hitherto belonged to territorial power. It reduces the duties on several of the necessities of life, and on objects in which England does not fear any competition; but it has most carefully preserved them on others which demand protection. It is certain that England hopes to induce other great Powers to follow her example; but will she succeed in doing so? In order to imitate her, in my opinion, one ought to be in the same situation as England—she ought to be competed with on equal terms. But this is not an easy matter, for what nation has so much machinery, as

powerful a navy, and so many colonies? [Hear, hear.] England has only decided to be liberal in commercial matters when she found her advantage in having her trade as free as possible; she has not decided to be liberal in her own manufactures and her own commerce, and she has not decided to be liberal in her own colonies. Legislation has had for its object the protection of our manufactures and the development of our shipping industry. We remain within the line so drawn until such time as, in England, we shall have no longer need of such protection. Political economy may, at their case, declare themselves partisans of free-trade, but a prudent Government ought to be otherwise—ought to carefully weigh interests of every kind and protect them steadily. Prohibition has run its race; we ought to enter on a course of advancement and of steady moderate protection; but beyond that we ought not to go. [Hear.] Let us reserve to ourselves the home market, for it will always be found to be best. When our productive power shall be as great as that of England, we may act as she is now doing; but success in what she is attempting is only possible where an immense manufacturing development exists. We, however, propose to present next session a bill which will make very considerable modifications in our present duties, but we shall act with caution, and shall endeavor to conciliate all interests. [Hear, hear.]"

There is much in the language of the Minister of Commerce that trenches or grates on the *entente cordiale*. Sir ROBERT PEEL affirmed, in the House of Commons, that the French Government preferred and espoused the free-trade doctrine, but was obstructed, indeed overruled, by an aristocracy of monopolists in both the Chambers. The honest Mr. CUNNINGHAM has contradicted that assertion, as far as it regards his Ministry. He should be held the organ of the whole Government in the matter; yet there are singular appearances. Mr. GUZOT engaged in the debate afterwards, omitting all notice of his colleague's positions. The *Journal des Debats*, especially the Court reflection—signifies lively dissatisfaction and dissent: "The speech has a certain degree of reach and consequence; its views are not liberal enough," &c. The whole effusion is pointedly disparaged and argumentatively counteracted. A future and broader critique is promised. Furthermore, the obnoxious division of the speech is suppressed in the report of the debate in the Debats, whose stenographers are rarely deficient in comprehension or exactitude. Mr. GUZOT and the KING may wish to be understood, at London, as more liberal than the head of the Department of Commerce. The other Paris journals of weight accept the ideas of CUNNINGHAM, and tack to them what he could not introduce—the fears of social convulsions and political subversions, by which the sagacious Premier was actuated.

### EXTRACTS FROM LATE FOREIGN JOURNALS.

In the British House of Commons, on the 23d March, Lord Palmerston interrogated Sir Robert Peel concerning the hostile proceedings in South America. Commerce was seriously interrupted, and warlike operations were carried on, yet the Government used only language of peace. He desired to know what instructions had been given to Mr. Ouseley.

Sir Robert Peel answered at considerable length, but gave little information. The essential point of what he said was that Mr. Ouseley had no instructions for the hostile operations on the Parana river. His instructions were merely to blockade certain ports. No very satisfactory account had been received by the Government of the transactions which led to the expedition upon the Parana. Such an expedition was not contemplated in the instructions given. A full explanation had been required. He hoped the subject might